Human Events YOUR WASHINGTON SERVICE

Vol. XVIII, No. 26 June 30, 1961 Section I — News

JFK: *The public is disenchanted* .....(405)

STATE DEPT: *Bad security setup?* .....(405)

FOREIGN AID: *Well paid lobbyists* .....(406)

RED CHINA: *Military men speak* .....(406)

TOWER: *He towers on TV* .....(408)

Honeymoon's End: "The shortest Presidential honeymoon on record," quip Capitol Hill veterans as they compare, unfavorably, President Kennedy's post-inaugural reception by the press, the public and Congress with Harry S. Truman's experience. The Missourian enjoyed country-wide favor for at least a year after taking the oath of President. The terminal date on JFK's happy days might not unreasonably be placed at three months—after the Cuban fiasco in April.

Much sympathy for the young President's plight for a few weeks after the fiasco changed to acrid public reaction when JFK unveiled the "Tractors for Freedom" project. Ominously, congressional mail from constituents today includes a certain number of demands that Congress impeach the President.

Such demands, of course, are absurd. But their appearance is considered, on Capitol Hill, indicative of the President's descent in popular esteem.

This gains added significance as congressional veterans recall that a similar phenomenon materialized in 1950-51, during the Korean War, to reveal Truman's sharp decline in public favor.

On December 6, 1950, HUMAN EVENTS reported that one Western Senator received 25 letters in one day demanding impeachment of Truman, but that Capitol Hill regarded such a proposal as "absurd." The consensus was that such "whiffs of steam" had significance only in that they showed many people felt we lacked competent leadership.

Such talk is again abroad in the land. But GOP members privately discuss the new phenomenon in connection with President Kennedy's uncertain health. One Republican Senator, in our hearing, speculated on what might happen if Lyndon Johnson had to serve for a few weeks or months as Acting President if JFK found himself physically incapacitated temporarily. It is recalled in Washington that Kennedy was in the hospital for several months in 1954—some of that time in great pain. If the Vice President had to take over, said the GOP solon, there would be much dissension between Johnson and other figures (such as Robert Kennedy) in the New Frontier, to the detriment of the country.

One factor offers a hopeful alternative to the uncertain leadership of the Kennedy Administration —the emergence of a vigorous and constructive opposition. It stemmed not only from the June 18 appearance on National Broadcasting Company television of an array of Republican critics, from former President Eisenhower on down; and not only from Senator Styles Bridges on June 19 when the New Hampshire legislator outlined what US policy on Berlin should be; but also from the appearance of Richard M. Nixon in a soundly-worded, but unsparing critique of Administration foreign policy (See "Nixon" story on page 406).

Such a positive factor may already be bearing fruit. For many months the GOP has firmly demanded an end to the ban on nuclear testing, if the Russians continued their refractory tactics. Nixon started it during the Presidential campaign and Republicans on the Hill carried on in the same vein. Today, it looks as if this constructive opposition to the test ban—as well as demands for a strong Berlin stand—may help stiffen Kennedy's weak-kneed foreign policies.

Security Clearance: Although the matter has not received press publicity, many in Washington have become alarmed at the manner in which the current Administration is waiving security clearances for persons assigned to key posts here and abroad.

During the Eisenhower Administration, the matter of full security clearance was waived in only a dozen or so cases. Usually it was a situation in which a person, of whom the Federal government was already reasonably sure, was needed to perform a special rush assignment overseas. Early in his Administration, Ike signed Executive Order 10450 —which called for full investigation and clearance of all Federal government personnel.

Now, although the Kennedy Administration is less than a half year old, reliable sources estimate that some 200 individuals have been given State Department and other Administration posts without proper clearance, simply through the use of Executive waivers.

New State Security Head: There is considerable displeasure and concern on Capitol Hill as a result of the Kennedy Administration's choice to head the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. This is the top security job in State.

Named last week was Salvatore Anthony Bontempo, who since 1958 has been New Jersey's Commissioner of Conservation and Economic Development. Bontempo, 51, has been in Jersey Democratic politics for years, but just what experience he has

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had regarding security or the problems of Communist penetration and subversion remains a mystery.

Since the Security and Consular Affairs post was set up in 1953, it has been headed by three men—all of whom had extensive experience in security and investigative work. The first, Scott McLeod, had been with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Successors Rodric O'Connor and John W. Hanes, who left the post in January, both had long experience in Federal investigation and security. The number two man to Bontempo, named recently, is Michel Cieplimski, who was born in Poland in 1906 and who has been in the United States 14 years. Until recently he headed the Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee. Like Bontempo his experience hardly qualifies him for the vital job of clearing State Department personnel.

It is no secret on Capitol Hill that House Committee on Un-American Activities Chairman Francis Walter (D.-Pa.) vigorously opposed Bontempo's appointment. And Congressman Gordon H. Scherer (Ohio), ranking Republican on the Committee, told HUMAN EVENTS: "It is appalling that the President should appoint a man totally untrained, inexperienced and generally unequipped to occupy such a position in our Nation's security dike. We are playing fast and loose with the internal security of this nation."

Foreign Aid: Did President Kennedy know that he spoke on the same platform for foreign aid as did a registered foreign agent, whose company had received large sums for his representation of a foreign government? Andrew Schoeppel (R.-Kan.) asked this question in the Senate last week as he lifted the curtain on an extraordinary facet of the whole foreign aid program. (See his remarks in the *Congressional Record* of June 21, pages 10224-10233.)

The "foreign agent" mentioned by Schoeppel was David E. Lilienthal, a former TVA director and former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, presently head of the Development & Resources Corp., which—remarked Schoeppel—"according to Mr. Clapp's letter, made almost a million dollars in fees from the Government of Iran in the period 1956 to 1960." Clapp is President of Research & Development Corporation; Lilienthal is Chairman of the Board of R&D. The corporation is registered with the US Government under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. On June 16, in Washington's Shoreham Hotel, Lilienthal spoke at a meeting which was also addressed by President Kennedy.

Senator Schoeppel also read into the *Congressional Record* a HUMAN EVENTS news item entitled "Iranian Gold Mine" of June 2 which dealt with this matter; and the Senator put into the *Record* a table of monies received by all foreign agents listed with the Department of Justice from 1955 to 1959—which reveals many interesting details about other foreign agents. The Kansan wound up his remarks by inviting members of the Senate Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees to examine this interesting situation in regard to foreign aid.

Top Brass on Red China: Six outstanding retired military men and an attorney laid it on the line last week as to what they think of the movement to admit Red China into the United Nations. Headed by the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Arthur W. Radford, the group is known as the American Security Council. It has 2,700 member organizations. Its Red China report was prepared by Radford, Loyd Wright, former American Bar Association President, Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, Admiral Ben Moreell (now head of the Americans for Constitutional Action), Admiral Felix B. Stump, Rear Admiral Chester Ward and General Albert C. Wedemeyer.

The report stated that "the United States' strategic position in the Far East, already severely undermined by Communist successes in Laos, would be irreparably damaged by Red China's admission into the UN."

It stated that America's moral position as free world leader would be "destroyed," were we to go along with Red China's entry.

The committee report left little doubt as to who were considered the prime movers in the admit-Red China push. It branded the United Kingdom and the British Commonwealth (to quote the Baltimore *Sun*) "as the chief proponents of admission of Red China to the UN." The report stated that the British have concluded that a policy of accommodation with communism is necessary to permit England to "trade and survive."

"The British are playing their game of global accommodation with other people's chips," Loyd Wright said. Admiral Ward told HUMAN EVENTS that he believes that "a Commonwealth bloc led by England" is the prime force in this matter and that we should let the English know in advance that, should the Reds be admitted, they "may have to face the possibility of a UN without the US."

Nixon: Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon exploded into print last week in his first nationally-syndicated column (copyrighted by the Times-Mirror Syndicate). Sounding like the Nixon of old (which, incidentally, did not hurt him, as even the liberal Washington *Post* gave him a gracious nod), he threw ice water on the proposal, set aloft by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, that Berlin be made a "free city."

Nixon's article figured prominently in the debate over Mansfield's proposal, opposed most emphatically by Senator Styles Bridges, ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Jack Miller (R.-Iowa) inserted Nixon's article in the *Congressional Record.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nixon piece pointed out that the "free city" idea did not originate with Mansfield or the Administration but in the "war councils of the Soviet Union." Khrushchev, said Nixon, offered to make West Berlin "a free city" (on November 27, 1958).

While Mansfield revised the Khrushchev proposal so that all of Berlin, not just the Western sector, should become a "free city," this would still leave that city at the mercy of the Communists, said Nixon. "This means, in effect, an undefended city, surrounded entirely by major Soviet and Soviet puppet forces, and abandoned by its present Western defenders." Furthermore, asked Nixon, how could an unarmed Berlin resist a Communist takeover from the sea of Communists surrounding it when "whole nations like Czechoslovakia could not?"

The trial balloon, said Nixon, "should be shot down by the President himself."

"Loyal Opposition": Events of last week may bring an abandonment, in polite society, of the term "The Loyal Opposition," the title used by NBC for its June 18 program of separately-filmed interviews with 22 Republican leaders, headed by former President Eisenhower. It is rumored that both Ike and the GOP National Committee objected to the title as "negative." But it is well known that Republican leaders have for some time been far from enthusiastic about the phrase, as used in the press. Their reactions run as follows:

What opposition party since the Civil War has not been loyal? (Since the War Between the States the Southerners' patriotism has, if anything, outshone that of their brothers in the North.) The very use of the word "loyal" implies that the opposition, whether Democratic or Republican, could possibly be "disloyal." Use of the expression is, to say the least, presumptuous. So runs the criticism of many in Washington.

It is believed that some of the eggheads, now at large in Washington, have sought to propagate use of the term, in order to intimidate Republicans into acquiescence of the New Frontier program.

Apparently the liberals have borrowed the term from English history, and in so doing have gotten in over their depth. Professors W. B. Munro and M. Ayearst in their book, *The Governments of Europe,* remark that the expression " 'loyal Opposition' has now passed out of general use in England. The Ministers of the Crown Act of 1937 simply refers to 'the Opposition.' "

The professors point out how the expression arose, following the fierce dynastic conflicts of the 17th Century, before there were parties, only "king's men" and "king's enemies." In the 18th and 19th Centuries, the gradual evolution of the Crown and Cabinet took place as real parties developed. Then "king's enemies" faded as the English accepted the idea that men could be opposed to the existing government without being enemies of the state. The concept of "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition" emphasized this revolutionary change. By this century, the expression went into disuse—and has only been kept alive in the US through ignorance or guile.

Actually, no Englishman would entertain the idea of "loyalty" to the Prime Minister; his loyalty is to the Crown. The P. M. is an elected official and as head of the majority party is subjected to constant criticism from the opposition. Similarly, it is pointed out, the US President is a party head, popularly elected, to whom the opposition owes nothing but constructive criticism. He has no "loyal opposition"; he has only "the opposition." Loyalty is to the flag, the Republic and the Constitution.

Goldwater: Arizona's Senator Barry Goldwater last week outlined his idea to include instruction on communism in the Administration-sponsored bill to expand the National Defense Education Act.

Goldwater stated that he would prefer no bill to extend the Act, deeming it a further step in the Federal government's interference with education. But realizing that the Senate will vote for one, he is now attempting to get the best one possible. He said on the floor of the Senate that "what disturbs me most about the pending bill is the utter casualness with which its proponents and supporters are determined to expand the Act's scope to matters which are related to national defense only in the most indirect fashion, while simultaneously proposing to eliminate those which are directly related thereto."

Goldwater had pointed out that the non-Communist disclaimer affidavit, part of the original Act, would be knocked out by the Administration's bill, and that this bill provided courses in such "national defense" subjects as folklore, church music, etc. He would pare down the bill to include only grants for studies in mathematics, science, languages and communism.

In support of his attempt to add grants for the study of communism to the bill, Goldwater said: "Whether he knows it or not, every American is involved in the 'Cold War.' As Colonel Kintner once expressed it, 'The Front is Everywhere.' Unfortunately, a good many Americans are unaware of it, and a good many more either know nothing of the enemy or have the most misleading conceptions about it. Nothing is more seriously needed in enlisting the aid of our educational system for purposes of national defense than the broadening of that system to provide instruction in 'knowing our enemy.' "

California Reds: The Communist Party of California is steadily growing, after languishing for several years. Such was the verdict of the California State Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on

JOHN G. ACKELMIRE, Associate Editor, The Indianapolis News, Indianapolis, Indiana: "HUMAN EVENTS is indispensable reading for the newspaperman who writes 'think' pieces and wants to be well informed in doing that."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Un-American Activities in a vitally important report recently released.

The Committee, under the direction of Fresno Democrat Hugh Burns, pointed to the "disgraceful student riots" a year ago when the House Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in San Francisco. The California group said that in the southern Golden State City of Elsinore, Communists had succeeded in fomenting distrust, confusion and racial tension.

The report stated also that Communists were making headway on California campuses, pointing to Marxist groups that have sprung up at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Reds were planning other such groups at Stanford, San Jose State, San Francisco State, Chico State and the University of California at Berkeley.

Tax Program: Republican Senators last week opened debate on President Kennedy's tax program with a volley of criticisms. Senate Minority Whip Thomas H. Kuchel (Calif.), not particularly known for his conservative stance, severely condemned any repeal of the four per cent tax credit on income from dividends. Senator John J. Williams (Del.) also rapped the proposed repeal of dividend credit and slammed into the Administration's formula for depreciation liberalization.

"Repealing the dividend tax credit," said Williams, "would cost the nation's taxpayers about $400 million a year" and thus diminish their ability to reinvest in an expanded economy. The tax credit, said Williams, was approved in 1954, because Congress wanted to provide an adjustment for income taxed first as corporation profit, and then as dividends paid to individuals.

Union Shop Case: The Supreme Court's decision on June 19 in the Georgia "union shop" case produced so many confusing and conflicting opinions from the nine Justices that it was some time before it could be figured out who won—the union bosses or the rank-and-file of unionized working men. But it was finally determined that the bosses had won a major point, and the men a minor one, which may mean nothing.

The High Court's majority refused to follow the Georgia Supreme Court in outlawing compulsory unionism because of political spending by unions—spending from dues that men have to pay to keep their jobs, men who may and often do have political ideas different from those of their leaders.

Thus the union bosses won on this vital point, and there is little probability that their style will be cramped in continued spending to elect political candidates they support.

But five Justices ruled that if a union member objects to his dues being spent politically, he can get back that part of his money which was spent for this purpose. This was welcomed as establishing a principle. However, practically, it means nothing, as was pointed out by Justice Charles E. Whittaker. The objecting union member must "affirmatively" express himself, which presumably means he must sign a document placing himself in opposition to his union leadership—thus laying himself open to reprisals. The facts of labor life are that very few men are likely to do that, particularly when the money regained would not be worth the risk of being thrown out of a job.

High Tax New Frontier: Little noted by the press a fortnight ago was a Republican party attempt that nearly brought an end to the 10 per cent transportation tax that has existed since World War II. In asking that the tax be extended for a year, the President ignored the recommendations of his own Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the transportation industry.

The House vote was 196 to 189. The bill passed by a narrow margin, thanks to real whip-cracking by the field generals of the New Frontier. What they were able to do can be shown by what happened to three of the eight Democrats who had introduced separate bills to repeal the 10 per cent tax.

When Administration leaders discovered they needed additional votes, they "persuaded" three of those eight Democrats to vote against what amounted to their own bill. The three: Abraham Multer of New York, John Lesinski of Michigan and John Slack of West Virginia.

Tower: Ten million persons—the estimate of broadcasters—saw Senator John Tower on "Meet the Press," Sunday, June 18. Viewers saw why this five-feet-five college professor was able to carry a state-wide election in Texas. The interrogators were Richard Wilson of *Look* magazine and Des Moines and Minneapolis dailies, Sarah McLendon of the El Paso *Times*, Raymond Brandt of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* and Robert Abernathy of NBC News. The panelists asked hostile questions and received in reply succinct expressions of the conservative philosophy. General opinion in the Nation's Capital is that conservatives have discovered another articulate voice. Transcripts of the broadcast can be obtained by sending 10 cents to Merkle Press, 810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50; 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number, if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $20. Only 1956 and 1960 available.

Frank C. Hanighen, *Editor and Publisher* James L. Wick, *Executive Publisher*
Fred W. Perkins, *Labor Editor* W. B. Hicks, Jr., *Assistant Publisher*

Assistant Editors

John R. Benedict George O. Fowler Allan H. Ryskind
Svend Petersen Bruce R. Barr John R. Moreau
Neil Phelps-Munson Kenneth E. Thompson Sherrill A. Backer
Contributing Editors: Frank Chodorov Edna Lonigan

Production Manager: Robert M. Patterson

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

--- COMMENTARY ---

Open Letter to JFK:

Let's keep the tractors. Send Castro the Committee.

Signed,
The American People

Vol. XVIII, No. 26 — Section II

June 30, 1961

Nuclear Test Ban

By Fulton Lewis, Jr.

CAMPAIGN PROMISES are admittedly a dime a dozen, but John Fitzgerald Kennedy has defaulted on one of the major vows he made to the American people last fall.

In October, 1960, Candidate Kennedy attempted to reassure Republicans and Democrats alike that he was no fuzzy-eyed thinker, no starry-eyed idealist when it came to world disarmament.

If elected President, he declared, he would issue an ultimatum to the Soviet leaders. Unless they agreed to a test ban within a "reasonable but definite time limit" imposed by JFK, the US would resume testing nuclear weapons.

Moreover, Kennedy promised to give the Atomic Energy Commission the green light to plan underground nuclear tests while the Geneva talks were still underway—to demonstrate that the US was in deadly earnest.

Seven months after his election, the President has still not implemented either promise. The White House admits that no time limit has been set. And the AEC still awaits the word from Mr. Kennedy to begin planning a series of underground tests.

Meanwhile, the clamor on Capitol Hill for a resumption of US testing grows. Politicians on both sides of the aisle sadly admit that this country's two-year, self-imposed ban on nuclear arms perfection has been wrong. Few disagree with Eisenhower's AEC Chairman John McCone that the Reds are undoubtedly testing nuclear weapons in secret.

Even the redoubtable Hubert Humphrey, once the most vocal of all disarmament advocates, feels it is time for a change. The garrulous Minnesota Democrat went on record as favoring a resumption of US tests unless the Soviets agreed to a test ban by June 1.

Senator Henry Jackson, who served as Democratic National Chairman during Kennedy's successful Presidential campaign, has come around to a similar view. On a network TV show recently, Jackson said that the Soviets have no intention of agreeing to a workable test ban. He advocated immediate resumption of underground tests.

The Republican leadership is solidly against the Geneva test ban talks. Summing up Republican sentiment, Richard Nixon declares:

"It would be less than prudent to assume that the Soviet Union has not been testing . . . secretly . . . since the US voluntarily put a moratorium on its own bomb testing."

Pentagon officials have pleaded in vain with Kennedy to renounce the US moratorium. Development of atomic arms suited for limited war, they show, has come to a screeching halt.

SENSITIVE SAFE CRACKER

In this category is the atomic bazooka, a portable, lightweight weapon ideally suited for the jungles of Laos and Southeast Asia. Also included are a whole series of top-secret nuclear warheads code-named for birds such as "dove" and "starling." In escrow on Pentagon drawing boards, these need final testing before they can be deployed to troops around the globe.

Navy scientists are unable to test smaller, lighter nuclear warheads for the Polaris missile. Both the Army and the Air Force wish to experiment with new ideas for anti-missile defense. They are unable to do so.

There is also the neutron bomb, a weapon that could revolutionize nuclear warfare as the A-bomb changed conventional warfare. This weapon would act as a death ray, destroying all human life in a general vicinity, but leaving buildings and plants undamaged.

It is today nothing more than a theory. But American scientists, confined as they are by Washington strait jackets, are powerless to discover more.

If majority will is infallible, why then have government of law at all? Why establish institutions of government? Why create the tripartite system under a constitution?

—Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.)

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Missile Program Lags as Unions Squabble

By Victor Riesel

IT MAY BE LATER than you think. But what matters what you think compared with what a band of Cape Canaveral labor officials think—the same defiant ones who got in the way of Commander Shepard's space ship. These fellows with a baronial taste for telling off the Pentagon, also, it now develops, got in the way of the vital Pershing Missile. Apparently the Cape Canaveral electrical workers were not in as much of a hurry over Pershing (Series 200), Complex Thirty, as were the Joint Chiefs of Staff a few months back.

The Pershing is an Army ground support missile which can be moved easily by cargo plane or helicopter. The Pentagon wanted Pershing testing "accelerated" late last summer. But the leaders of Local 756, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, refused to handle special cable which arrived at the base already cut for size and installation.

This cable, it must be noted immediately, was "prefabricated"—cut—by members of another union over in an Orlando, Florida plant where the Martin Co. produces the Pershing. When the electrical workers, members of the local which delayed the work on the US man-in-space shot, refused to install prefabricated Pershing Missile wiring, they were asked why.

Stout fellows, these. They had a ready answer. They had to go "cleaning their yards . . . cleaning their swimming pool . . . and go fishing." They were fired. When the Pentagon contractors tried to get new help from the Local, its leader, Robert Palmer, went into the hiring hall and personally polled unemployed workers there. Though jobless, the men did not go out on the lucrative assignment. Why?

Government officials later looked into the stalled work. Documents from these National Labor Relations Board examiners and reviewers said that Palmer had "clearly indicated to those in the hiring hall that they should not accept" these jobs.

Palmer's "conduct" was described as "unlawful inducement . . . (and) discouragement of those in the hiring hall from accepting employment . . . (and was) tantamount to a categorical refusal to make a referral" of workers to replace those who were "going fishing" or "cleaning their swimming pool."

A Federal District court finally ordered Palmer and the local to start supplying men. They did—but the government people now tell us that "similar" disputes are "likely to arise in the future." The government states officially that this is an "unresolved conflict" and that the "conduct of the union . . . will be repeated."

This is no penny ante argument. The Martin Co. has contracts worth over $100 million annually for the manufacture of missiles and other materials and the testing and firing of missiles at Cape Canaveral. Any dispute there over who cuts a piece of wire could have impact on how Moscow cuts up the peace.

So here's the background of this war of cables. The Martin Co. produces the Pershing at its Orlando plant. It trucks the missile over to the Cape along with the cables. These cables are part of the electronic control system inside the blockhouse. The wiring also runs to the launching pad and is, in addition, connected to the missile itself. At the Orlando plant this cable is scientifically cut.

Each must be sliced to fit into the "extremely complicated" electrical systems. These cables contain many strands of wire—each of which must be joined to the appropriate pin in a "terminal connector" to set up each circuit for the firing. Each series of tests requires changing in the wiring systems—and new sets of cable. And there's the rub. These cables are prepared in advance at the Orlando plant by members of the United Auto Workers.

These, therefore, are union-made cables. But here is the preposterous picture of one union refusing to handle another union's products.

Whatever it is the regional labor men are delaying —there's one test they're speeding. That's the testing of the public's patience.

SENATOR CAUCUS by Pete Wyma

"In my opinion there are still too many politicians who believe in 'government *off* the people; *buy* the people; and *floor* the people!"

REPRINTS of this section available: single copy 20c; 10 for $1; 25 for $2; 100 for $5; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. Order by section number and date of issue.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50. After you have read each section of HUMAN EVENTS, put it in an envelope and mail it to someone else who will value its contents. Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How to Handle Castro

From the Tampa Tribune

Since the State Department still doesn't seem to have anybody who knows what to do about Fidel Castro, we suggest it talk to Erwin Harris of Miami. Mr. Harris knows.

Back in 1959, the Harris advertising agency was hired by the Cuban Tourist Commission to handle a $1,600,000 advertising campaign designed to lure more American spenders to Cuba. Soon afterward, the Castro government began cheering Russia and kicking the United States in the face. Harris says he then canceled the contract but more than $300,000 in magazine advertising already had been booked.

When he went to Cuba to try to collect what was due him, Castro sent him to Che Guevara, the Communist economic boss, and Guevara laughed in his face. Guevara laughed at the wrong man.

Harris promptly began his own guerrilla campaign against the Castro government. Armed with a federal court judgment, he seized everything from Cuba he could lay hands on, including the $3,000,000 jetliner in which Castro flew to New York for the United Nations meeting last September. He ran full-page newspaper advertisements in New York —while Castro was there—challenging the Cuban dictator to pay his just debt. He impounded bank accounts in which the Cuban government had some interest.

Harris hasn't yet collected all his money.

But he has brought about the seizure and sale of five Cuban airplanes (the Castro jet got away from him on a prior British claim), he has padlocked the New York office of Cubana Airlines, and he has put the Castro government and the people doing business with it to endless trouble.

In short, Mr. Harris has a deep conviction that if a fellow tries to cheat you, and caps the injury with insult, hit the bum with anything you can.

That strikes us as a very sound philosophy. To a State Department which appears to have none of its own, we heartily commend the Harris policy for dealing with Deadbeat Castro.

Anti-Trust Puzzlement

From the New York Daily News

The Government nails a lot of big electrical equipment companies, including General Electric, for price-fixing, bid-rigging and other violations of the anti-trust laws.

Now, the Government threatens a suit if GE doesn't sign a promise not to sell its products "at unreasonably low prices." This, allegedly to protect small concerns from being undersold out of business.

Yet the object of the anti-trust laws is to keep prices down and prevent growth of monopolies which will charge too much for their stuff. What kind of facing-both-ways monkey business is this, anyway?

The Farm Program

"If the Administration is successful in getting the legislation it is asking for, the American farmer will be dangling precariously from dead center. He will be pelted from both sides by committees and left to stew in a pot of apathy and a jungle of confusion. How can we, with a clear conscience, stand idly by and let our farmers and our whole nation suffer at the hands of such quackery?"

—Congressman Fred Schwengel (R.-Iowa)

Unemployment Figures

From the Washington Daily News

Any common-sense consideration of the US unemployment problem should start by disposing of some of the myths which confuse the issue.

Principal among these is the idea that there are nearly five million seeking work and unable to find it. The exact, current figure, issued by the Government, is 4,768,000.

The impression these figures convey obviously is false. In high percentage—no one knows how high—these figures are built into the system and are multiplied by it.

Consider, for instance, the millions retiring from the labor market, for reasons of age; in the case of women, to get married, or just because they are sick of work and can avoid it. They don't intend to go back to work. They are not hunting jobs. They are avoiding them. And yet they can collect unemployment compensation for half a year or more. For this length of time they are statistically unemployed.

Another fairly large class is composed of those not looking for steady work. They pile up enough credits to get on unemployment compensation, lay off until it runs out, get another job and repeat the process.

There is, furthermore, a class which would rather maintain a mere existence on relief than work for a living. These also add to the unemployment statistics.

This is not to argue that everyone out of work can find a job if he wants it. There are many honestly unemployed, for whom the unemployment compensation system was designed.

Chiselers on the system drain the funds which should go to the real unemployed, in the form of larger checks for longer periods. They also swell the statistics to alarming proportions, obscuring the fact that the main trouble is in key industrial areas which have failed to engage in sufficiently vigorous price competition, either for the domestic or the foreign market.

"World peace through world health" sounds fine, but some of the healthiest people we've ever known have been the least peaceful.

—San Diego Union

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Proxmire's Dilemma

One of the most interesting events on Capitol Hill—it might even be termed a political human interest story—is the agonizing reappraisal Wisconsin's Democratic Senator William Proxmire has been going through regarding his longtime advocacy of liberal-Keynesian economic policies.

Since coming to the Senate in 1957, Proxmire has consistently voted with Hubert Humphrey and other super spenders in support of extravagant deficit measures. In the ACA ratings "For Economy, Conservation and against Waste," Proxmire scored a low 17 per cent. Thus far in the 87th Congress he has largely supported the New Frontier's spending schemes (although he voted to recommit a $221,000,000 bill for a Navajo Indian irrigation project).

Yet, if his recent utterances mean anything, the articulate and personable gentleman from the Badger State may well be a forthcoming convert to conservatism. As evidence, Proxmire recently stated in a report of the Joint Economic Committee that government spending and deficit financing were the wrong ways in which to cure the unemployment problem. He pointed out that the Federal government consistently ran heavy deficits from 1931 through 1940, but that unemployment was never reduced below 14 per cent—twice the current level —in the entire ten years.

This change of pace by Proxmire drew immediate criticism from Keynesian professors in his home state. A group of professors from several Wisconsin colleges expressed shock at Proxmire's stand. Professor Robert Ozanne of the University of Wisconsin said that he was "dumbfounded" that Proxmire could turn his back on the Keynesian ideal, and that the Senator's views were as bad as "those of ex-President Herbert Hoover."

Undaunted, possible-convert Proxmire followed up with a letter to the Chicago *Tribune* in which he said: "The steady, relentless climb in government spending, especially if accompanied by ever-larger deficits, constitutes a growing challenge to the freedom of this nation." Both Wisconsin and the nation wait to see whether Proxmire will begin to vote the way he now talks.

In connection with this, Senator Barry Goldwater told HUMAN EVENTS last week: "As the pressures for higher and more inflation increase, and the dangers of such a path become increasingly apparent, the number of converts to fiscal responsibility will grow."

Invariably today's liberals seem to take the path of least resistance. In political terms, this means the dumping of every problem, no matter how small, in the lap of the Federal Government.

—Congressman Charles M. Teague (R.-Calif.)

The House Committee on Government Operations is investigating the reason why someone in government had prepared and printed at public expense a pamphlet entitled: "Tea Drinking in 18th Century America: Its Etiquette and Equipage." We await with bated breath the report of the investigators.

—Congressman H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa)

The Pitney-Bowes Case

The Pledge of Allegiance may now be used on postage meters. This is a reversal of attitude by the Pitney-Bowes Company which earlier rejected the message for a postage meter leased by the Spindale Mills, Spindale, North Carolina.

The plate will read: "We pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands."

Spindale Mills is a subsidiary of the Cherokee Textile Mills of Sevierville, Tennessee, headed by A. G. Heinsohn, Jr.

Pitney-Bowes is still demanding the return of the plate from the Cherokee Mills which contains a statement interpreted by Pitney-Bowes to be "controversial": "This is a republic not a democracy. Let's keep it that way." The Cherokee Mills has said "No" to the request and is still using the plate. By its continued use, Cherokee Mills is inviting Pitney-Bowes to go to court and demand the return of the postage-meter machine owned by Pitney-Bowes and leased to Cherokee. The Post Office Department is also being challenged to refuse to accept postage-metered mail containing this statement.

Congressman Dominick's Taped Interview—$8

Peter H. Dominick, freshman Congressman from Colorado's 2nd District, who is currently being talked of as a candidate to unseat Democratic Senator John Carroll, is the guest on this week's CONGRESSIONAL INTERVIEW. Mr. Dominick explains how he campaigned and won election as a constitutional conservative, and discusses the administration-sponsored farm bill in terms of economic realities in America today.

DOMINICK

This 12½-minute tape-recorded interview is the sixteenth in the 1961 series of HUMAN EVENTS CONGRESSIONAL INTERVIEW.

The price for single interviews is $8. If you enter an order for one interview a month the price is $6, one a week $5. $1 is refunded for each tape returned.

Other interviews which you may wish to have are listed below. They are the first fifteen weekly interviews in the 1961 Series:

1. John H. Rousselot (R.-Calif.)
2. John M. Ashbrook (R.-Ohio)
3. William Jennings Bryan Dorn (D.-S.C.)
4. Peter A. Garland (R.-Maine)
5. Bruce Alger (R.-Texas)
6. Donald C. Bruce (R.-Ind.)
7. Harold R. Collier (R.-Ill.)
8. Richard H. Poff (R.-Va.)
9. Edward J. Derwinski (R.-Ill.)
10. Henry C. Schadeberg (R.-Wisc.)
11. John J. Rhodes (R.-Ariz.)
12. Edgar W. Hiestand (R.-Calif.)
13. Thomas M. Pelly (R.-Wash.)
14. John Bell Williams (D.-Miss.)
15. James F. Battin (R.-Mont.)

The 12½-minute length of these interviews makes them ideal for a 15-minute radio program. Many serve as the weekly highlight of organization meetings.

Help your organization and your community to *BE INFORMED ON TIME. Write now for* HUMAN EVENTS *CONGRESSIONAL INTERVIEW.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVIII, No. 26 -- Section III HUMAN EVENTS June 30, 1961

Stalin and FDR at Teheran

The 12th Army Air Force and Signal Corps took the above photograph and released it to the press on December 7, 1943, with the caption below:

"NO DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

"TEHERAN—This photo is symbolic of the understanding reached between United States and Russia at the three-power conference in Teheran. Marshal Josef Stalin (left) and President Franklin D. Roosevelt smile amiably as they sit together."

Another official photograph taken during the Teheran conference was released with quotations from FDR, beginning with his impression of Stalin:

"He's got a kind of massive [humility], talks deliberately, seems very confident, very sure of himself, moves slowly—altogether quite impressive, I'd say" . . . . "I'm sure we'll hit it off, Stalin and I" . . . . "As for Uncle Joe and Winston, well—I'll have my work cut out for me, in between those two. They're so different, ideas, temperaments" . . . . "The biggest thing was in making clear to Stalin that the United States and Great Britain were not allied in one common bloc against the Soviet Union. I think we've got rid of that idea, once and for all. I hope so. The one thing that could upset the applecart, after the war, is if the world is divided again, Russia against England and us. That's our big job now, and it'll be our big job tomorrow, too: making sure that we continue to act as referee, as intermediary, between Russia and England."

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JFK in FDR's Faulty Footsteps

On June 16 *the State Department released the Cairo-Teheran papers, official documents on these World War II conferences. Much speculation prevails as to why the Kennedy Administration chose to release the long-secret papers at this time. Syndicated columnist David Lawrence attributes the Administration's decision to an exclusive New York* Daily News *story on February* 17, *which reported that President Eisenhower, on leaving the White House, took with him proof sheets of the papers on the Teheran conference. Thus, reasons Lawrence, the Kennedy Administration "had no choice but to give them in full to the press."*

In any event, the Republican National Committee has published a series of four statements on the Cairo-Teheran papers, noting that "quotations are verbatim and, therefore, may be regarded as accurate." The Committee's statements are reprinted in full below.

Sell-Out of the Baltic States

Just as President Kennedy handled his talks with Khrushchev at Vienna single-handed, so an earlier Democratic President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, took no ranking State Department officials into his talks at Teheran in 1943.

As early as that, the Democratic President tacitly agreed that the hitherto independent Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania should be absorbed by the Soviet Union after World War II.

In the official papers on the Teheran Conference, held long before the war ended, Charles E. Bohlen, the translator, and a Kennedy aide at Vienna, reported:

"(The President) said (to Stalin) that he fully realized the three Baltic Republics had in history and again more recently been a part of Russia."

"(The President) added jokingly that when the Soviet armies *re-occupied* these areas, he did not intend to go to war with the Soviet Union on this point."

The Democratic President made clear that his chief reason for asking a popular referendum on the Baltic States rejoining Russia was because this would have a favorable effect on the voters at home.

"The President went on to say (to Stalin) that there were a number of persons of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian origin in that order in the United States.

"The big issue in the United States, insofar as public opinion went, would be the question of referendum . . . He said he thought that world opinion would want some expression . . . perhaps *not immediately* after their reoccupation by Soviet forces, but some day, and *he personally was confident the people would vote to join the Soviet Union.*"

Preparing the Sell-Out of Poland

At Teheran in 1943, long before the end of World War II, a Democratic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, agreed in principle to let Soviet ideas prevail with regard to the future of hitherto free Poland, according to the minutes kept by translator Charles E. Bohlen.

The President "said (to Stalin) personally he agreed with Marshal Stalin." But the Democratic President had some political considerations for not going into details.

"(The President) added that there were in the United States from six to seven million Americans of Polish extraction and, *as a practical man, he did not wish to lose their vote.*

"He would like to see the Eastern border (of Poland) moved further to the West and the Western border moved even to the River Oder.

"He hoped, however, that the Marshal (Stalin) would understand that *for the political reasons outlined* above, he could not participate in any decision here in Teheran . . . and that he could not *publicly* take part in any such arrangement at the present time."

In his personal address June 6 to the American people, Democratic President Kennedy stated, with regard to his Vienna talks alone with Khrushchev: "No new aims were stated in private that had not been stated in public on either side." He added, "Neither of us was there to dictate a settlement."

So incensed was Premier Khrushchev by this that he ordered Tass to publish the texts of memoranda on Berlin and nuclear arms tests he handed Kennedy at the Vienna meeting. The memorandum on Berlin gives an ultimatum of "a period not exceeding six months" for a settlement on Berlin recognizing East Germany and its alleged rights after which "we would have to sign a treaty" with East Germany. The nuclear test ban memo is in effect—accept our view or else. Now there are diplomatic discussions about Berlin. Is President Kennedy preparing to give ground on Berlin despite his contrary statements?

Dictatorial Diplomacy

The dangers to responsible government which are inherent in one-man diplomacy have never been better illustrated than by the State Department's "records" of the Cairo Conference of November 22-26, 1943.

At this fatal conference, post-war American policy in Asia was explored and developed in consultation between the President, Mr. Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek and their top military and political advisers. Yet, apart from some preliminary papers and some memoranda of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, there is virtually no official record of the numerous conversations held on the subject of the future of Asia.

Again and again, in noting the round of diplomatic lunches, dinners, meetings, sessions and discussions during the five fatal days, the State Department reports: "No records of these conversations have been found", "No minutes . . .", "No memoranda . . .", "No official American record", "No record," "No record", "No record".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here was an occasion when the future of the United States and of the world was being shaped, yet the American Department of State was compelled to request, in 1956, that the Chinese Government make available to us their summary record of the Roosevelt-Chiang Dinner Meeting at the President's villa on November 24, 1943. So for an account of what the President agreed on as to China's future role as one of the "Big Four" and leading power in the Far East, *we are compelled to accept the version of a foreign government.*

It is quite clear, however, that the Chinese record is correct in reporting that it was agreed solely between the President and Chiang, "Taiwan and the Penghu Islands (Pescadores) which Japan had taken from China by force must be restored to China after the war."

In this amazingly casual way, Formosa, which had been the first independent Republic in Asia, was transferred to China.

And it was only at Teheran, on November 28, 1943, that the American President casually revealed to Marshal Stalin that Chiang Kai-shek "had told him China had no designs on Indochina but the people of Indochina were not yet ready for independence" and that he, the President, "had discussed with Chiang Kai-shek the possibility of a system of trusteeship for Indochina which would have the task of preparing the people for independence within a definite period of time, perhaps 20 to 30 years."

The State Department record on this point speaks for itself: "Marshal Stalin," it reports, "completely agreed with this view," and when Churchill objected, "the President said, 'Now look here, Winston, you are outvoted three to one.' "

This may be magnificent but it is not diplomacy and there is, judging by Laos, every reason to doubt that it is even magnificent.

President Kennedy's recent personal discussion with Chairman Khrushchev falls into a similar slapdash perspective when we remember that, for the actual Soviet position on Berlin and atomic testing, we had to wait for the Kremlin to publish the documents which Mr. Khrushchev served on the President on this occasion. The President ignored or forgot to mention them in the course of his own radio report to the nation.

Suggests A Soviet-Type India

Carrying on the same one-man, secret diplomacy that President Kennedy has employed, another Democratic President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, shocked even the dictator of the Soviet Union with his proposals at Teheran in 1943.

"The President said . . . he would like to talk with Marshal Stalin on the question of India; that he felt that the best solution would be in reform from the bottom, somewhat on the Soviet line," translator Charles E. Bohlen reported in his official minutes.

Bohlen, who accompanied Kennedy to the recent Vienna two-man summit, also reported:

"Marshal Stalin replied that the India question was a complicated one, with different levels of culture and the absence of relationships in caste. He added that *reform from the bottom would mean revolution.*"

The Democratic President slyly said "he felt it would be better not to discuss India with Mr. (Winston) Churchill (also at the Teheran meeting)" and "Marshal Stalin agreed that this was a sore spot with the British."

Agrees with Reds on Indochina

The Democratic President not only undercut Churchill on India, then a British Dominion, and misread the true future of India under Nehru. But President Roosevelt also volunteered secretly to Stalin that the French, fighting again at his side, should give up Indochina. President Kennedy currently is having negotiations carried on at Geneva on free Laos, once a part of Indochina, and the fear is that he will effectively turn it over to the Communists, perhaps through a coalition government the Reds will dominate.

Bohlen officially reported that the Democratic President was "in 100 per cent agreement with Marshal Stalin" that "*France should not get back Indochina* (then occupied militarily by Japan)."

The Democratic President's reason was his further secret agreement with Stalin that "the *French must pay for their criminal collaboration with Germany.*" As an added opinion "he was 100 per cent in agreement with Marshal Stalin . . . that after 100 years of French rule in Indochina, the inhabitants were worse off than they had been before."

Today, the Communists have gone far in establishing the worst sort of tyranny and slavery over much of Indochina. Vietminh is a Communist dictatorship dominated by the Chinese and Russian Communists, independent Laos has been under Russian-led Communist military attack and Vietnam, the southern part of old Indochina, is endangered. The total effect is that all of Southeast Asia may fall to the Communists.

Wrong on Soviet Intentions

A Democratic President, Franklin Roosevelt, was so confident he could count on the post-war collaboration of the Soviet Union that he ceded hitherto free countries to Marshal Stalin in casual conversation at Teheran. At Cairo, according to the Chinese summary record of his talks with Chiang Kai-shek, Franklin D. Roosevelt was convinced that the Chinese could occupy the Liaotung Peninsula with its two ports, Lushun and Dairen, with Soviet approval, the secret papers reveal.

"Chiang stated that China would be prepared to place Lushun at the joint disposal of China and the United States," says the official report.

Lushun is the Chinese name for Port Arthur which the Czars seized; the Soviet Communists immediately seized Port Arthur when Japan collapsed. They also possessed themselves of Outer Mongolia which Roosevelt and Chiang tacitly agreed should be Chinese.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fatuity and danger of one-man, secret diplomacy was never better revealed than at the Cairo and Teheran conferences—unless it was at Vienna, which gave Stalin's successor, Khrushchev, a chance to open a new drive to obtain effective control of Berlin.

One-Man "Diplomacy" at Teheran

During World War II, Allied propaganda rightly ridiculed Hitler's "intuition"; yet the State Department's official record of the Teheran Conference, November 27-December 2, 1943, shows an American President "shooting from the hip" in a one-man diplomatic performance prophetic of recent foreign policy rodeos at Havana, Paris and Vienna.

This is particularly true of the Democratic war-President's judgments on the future of France, which he expected to remain weak and corrupt indefinitely; on the future of Germany, which he proposed to divide into five weak countries; on the future of China, which he believed would be an immediate member of an exclusive "Big Four" club to police the world; and on the character of the United Nations. On all of these points, the President was in error—almost completely.

Wrong on France

At a time when eleven French divisions were serving under General Eisenhower in North Africa, the President told Marshal Stalin that:

"Mr. Churchill was of the opinion that France would be very quickly reconstructed as a strong nation, but he did not personally share this view since he felt that many years of honest labor would be necessary before France would be re-established . . . . He repeated . . . that the French must pay for their criminal collaboration with Germany."

He also said "that in the future, no Frenchman over 40, and particularly no Frenchman who had ever taken part in the present French Government, should be allowed to return to position in the future."

This political inspiration must be contrasted with the emergence of France as an atomic-power under de Gaulle and President Kennedy's recent trip to Paris to conciliate that powerful nation.

Plays Power Politics

On the future of the United Nations, the President at Teheran was equally myopic. He particularly misjudged the future of China and proposed China as a member of "The Four Policemen" to enforce the peace—this after Chiang Kai-shek had advised him at Cairo that China lacked the power to participate in the occupation of Japan.

The President also proposed an executive committee composed of the "Four Policemen"—Britain, United States, the Soviet and China—plus two European states, one South American, one Near East, one Far Eastern country, and one British Dominion.

The State Department records that even Marshal Stalin made a dead-pan comment "that he did not think that the small nations of Europe would like the organization composed of the Four Policemen."

Wrong on German Future

In discussing the future of Germany, Stalin said that he personally believed that Germany would completely recover within 15 to 20 years. Stalin proposed that "at least 50,000 and perhaps 100,000 of the German Commanding Staff must be physically liquidated. To this the President replied "jokingly" that the figure of the German Commanding Staff which should be executed "would be 49,000 or more." And on December 1, 1943, the American President:

"said he had a plan that he had thought up some months ago for the division of Germany in five parts. These five parts were:

1. All Prussia (to be rendered as small and weak as possible).
2. Hanover and Northwest section.
3. Saxony and Leipzig area.
4. Hesse-Darmstadt, Hesse-Kassel and the area South of the Rhine.
5. Bavaria, Baden, and Wurttemberg.

"He proposed that these five areas should be self-governed and that there should be two regions under the United Nations or some form of International control. These were: 1. The area of the Kiel Canal and the City of Hamburg, 2. The Ruhr and the Saar, the latter to be used for the benefit of all Europe."

Contrast this somewhat less than brilliant glimpse into a crystal ball with West Germany's emergence as a full-fledged member of NATO and the Soviet's continued domination of a puppet East Germany and the two zones of Berlin, one slave and one free.

This provides a clear contrast of how one-man secret diplomacy compares with a considered and sound national policy. Democratic President Kennedy is following the same one-man secret diplomacy as the war-time Democratic President. President Kennedy, however, does not even have the excuse of war for maintaining secrecy.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D. C.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Send me _____ reprints of "JFK IN FDR's FAULTY FOOTSTEPS" at $ _____

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles add 1c per copy; for airmail add 2c per copy

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS
-- What YOU Can Do --

The merchants will manage commerce the better the more they are left free to manage for themselves.

—Thomas Jefferson

Vol. XVIII, No. 26 — Section IV June 30, 1961

JFK's Grab for Power

THE GRAB FOR POWER is the characteristic which distinguishes the Kennedy Administration from all preceding administrations. Old-timers in Congress say that the FDR and Truman Administrations were novices in comparison.

White House aides have been devoting the past month to making promises in exchange for votes for Federal aid to education and other measures building Government power. Congressmen from anti-New Frontier districts are being told if they vote pro-New Frontier they "will be taken care of" with Federal judgeships or other Federal jobs.

Some Congressmen willing to sell their votes are fearful that promises made privately may not be kept. They want an announcement issued to the press that Congressman "X" is to get the promised post on a specified date. They know that the Administration will have a hard time wiggling out of those kind of promises, once they are made.

However, Kennedy aides are reluctant to make public promises of jobs. Public revulsion might boomerang.

The Administration's latest grab for power is the attempt to "amend" Article 1, Section 1, of the Constitution, which reads:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

The Administration proposes that legislation passed by Congress be "flexible." The Executive Branch could raise or lower specified income tax rates within limits. The Secretary of Agriculture would have a free hand to decide the production quotas and selling prices for each of several hundred commodities and to allocate the proper share to each farm, setting severe penalties for nonconformists. The President could reorganize the bureaus and agencies of the Executive Branch.

After each Executive decree, the Congress could veto the action, but only within 60 days. In practice, such a veto would be near-impossible.

To illustrate the difficulty of congressional veto, the power of the Secretary of Agriculture would be so great that a Congressman would fear that his opposition to directives concerning one set of commodities would inspire retaliation concerning the commodities produced in his district.

Another proposal is that the Chief Executive be given the power to veto individual items in an appropriations bill. The consequences are not hard to imagine. Expenditures for the districts of congressional economizers Bruce Alger, H. R. Gross and August Johansen would certainly be vetoed as a hint to the voters of those districts to elect more "cooperative" Congressmen.

Harry Truman would have relished the chance to veto all projects going to Virginia as a means of driving home the force of his statement that "there are too many Byrds in Congress."

Write your Senators and your Representatives asking them to vote against all proposals giving the President the power to legislate and limiting the power of Congress to merely that of veto.

Since 1933, Congress has abdicated too much of its power. Tell your Senators and Representatives that Congress should quit taking slow poison.

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Attend The HUMAN EVENTS Political Action Conference

REGISTER NOW FOR HUMAN EVENTS SUMMER CONFERENCE

BARRY M. GOLDWATER
Senator from Arizona

JACK MILLER
Senator from Iowa

ANDREW SCHOEPPEL
Senator from Kansas

CHARLES M. TEAGUE
Rep. from California

DON L. SHORT
Rep. from North Dakota

JAMES F. BATTIN
Rep. from Montana

WILLIAM C. CRAMER
Rep. from Florida

ADMIRAL BEN MOREELL, USN (Ret.)
Chairman, Board of Trustees,
Americans for Constitutional Action
CONFERENCE KEYNOTER

HUMAN EVENTS will hold its second Political Action Conference at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C. on July 14 and 15. The limited registration quota is filling fast. You should plan now to attend, and make your reservations while they are still available.

Fifteen leading members of Congress and other important authorities will address the conference, and will answer your questions in seminar-type sessions.

The already overwhelming response to this second Conference, from people in all parts of the nation, indicates an unprecedented concern on the part of the American people. They are concerned about the dwindling of their individual liberties through the increasing centralization of governmental control. They are concerned about the increasing menace of foreign ideological aggression, and the refusal of high echelons among US policy-makers to resist. And they are concerned about their economic peril which the irresponsible wild spending of government promises almost daily to increase. Now Americans are impatient, as never before, to translate their concern into action to halt and reverse the march to the left.

The HUMAN EVENTS Summer Conference provides an opportunity to find out, first hand, from people who know the facts, just WHAT YOU CAN DO to help restore sound, honest, constitutional government and national dignity to America.

The Conference fee, which includes luncheon and dinner on both Friday and Saturday, is $75 per person and $40 for additional members of the same immediate family—wives, son, daughters. The $40 rate will also apply to students, teachers, clergymen and members of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists (ISI). Fees will be refunded to persons unable to attend for any reason whatsoever.

Hotel accommodations and breakfast are extra. Special room rates at the Mayflower Hotel have been arranged. Singles are priced at $10; doubles at $15. Every room is air conditioned.

If you have already made reservations, and now find that you will be unable to attend the Conference, *please let us know soon.* Space is at a premium, and must not go unused.

HUMAN EVENTS 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Friday Menu Preference

Name ..... ☐ Meat ☐ Fish

Address .....City.....Zone.....State.....

Name ..... ☐ Meat ☐ Fish

Address .....City.....Zone.....State.....

Name ..... ☐ Meat ☐ Fish

Address .....City.....Zone.....State.....

Name ..... ☐ Meat ☐ Fish

Address .....City.....Zone.....State.....

Enclosed is my check or money order in the amount of $..... to cover the Conference fee at $75 per person, and $40 for additional members of the same family.

In the listing of tentative subjects below, I have placed numbers (1 thru 7) to indicate the order of my preference.

☐ Communism
☐ Labor Problems
☐ Federal School Aid
☐ Foreign Aid
☐ Medicare
☐ Area Redevelopment
☐ 1962 Campaign

JOHN G. TOWER
Newly Elected Republican
Senator from Texas

ROMAN L. HRUSKA
Senator from Nebraska

KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
Rep. from New York

HOWARD W. ROBISON
Rep. from New York

HAROLD R. COLLIER
Rep. from Illinois

HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
Rep. from Wisconsin

E. Y. BERRY
Rep. from South Dakota

GORDON H. SCHERER
Rep. from Ohio

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Murrow Contradicts Adlai

By Holmes Alexander

THE BEST OF DOCTORS will differ both on diagnosis and cures, but when two spokesmen of the New Frontier contradict each other on the same subject, on the same day—well, you wonder if it's intellectual diversity or intellectual confusion:

UN Ambassador Adlai Stevenson indicated to President Stroessner of Paraguay that Paraguay would receive more US aid if that nation restores democratic procedures (*Wall Street Journal* news dispatch May 13, 1961).

US Information Director Edward Murrow told a graduation class that "we must not fall into what I call a 'fallacy of forms.' Other lands will seek forms and institutions of their own conjuring . . . We must neither impose our forms and methods nor expect others to imitate us in every respect. We cannot afford the folly of believing that our way is the only way . . ." (Commencement speech at Johns Hopkins University, same date).

Well, Stevenson is doing one thing, Murrow is preaching the opposite, both presumably with White House knowledge and consent. Is it now our policy to use Foreign Aid as a reward for the restoration of "democratic procedures" in dictatorship nations? Or is it now our policy, quoting Ed Murrow further, to encourage other nations to "choose forms and ways which we could not choose for ourselves"?

Somebody should tell Ambassador Stevenson that the criterion for receiving American aid ought not to be whether these foreigners practice "democratic procedures," but whether they wish to be allies in the war against communism. If they do so wish, then these countries should be asked to prove it with deeds and not with words. Senator Wayne Morse, chairman of the most important subcommittee on Latin America, tells me that they should prove it in practical ways—by taxing themselves to the extent of their ability to pay.

And somebody ought to ask Ed Murrow to follow his logic to the reasonable conclusion. He was talking, by the context of his speech, about the new, emergent, under-developed nations of the Southern Hemisphere. "To these peoples," he said, "we have much to show and to say. We would elevate their crushing way of existence into a more bountiful society."

But, surely, if these backward peoples have a right to run their countries as they see fit, the great civilized and successful nations whom we call the Western Allies deserve the same freedom from American nagging and hectoring, do they not? As events are developing, the self-determination of the very advanced, most cultivated, longest established nations on earth is at stake in our foreign policy.

In the United Nations we find the Kennedy Administration putting the USA in the position of lecturing Portugal on how to live after eight centuries of independence, siding with the Afro-Asian bloc against our Western Allies and voting for "immediate" action for democracy in Angola where, as I learn from some Commerce Department figures, there are only about three persons per kilometer in population, and only one per cent of literacy among the indigenous peoples.

I don't know if Messrs. Kennedy, Stevenson, Murrow and the rest take any time off to think things out—but I wish they would.

Goldwater's Rise

SENATOR GOLDWATER, spoken of as the "outside man" among Republicans because of his astonishing strength outside of Washington, has also been serving as a lightning rod of persistent flashes in the political distances. There are those documentary evidences that the Republican Presidential nomination is performing the almost forgotten function of seeking a man who is seriously going about his business without giving it a covetous glance:

• Members of Congress went home for Easter and Memorial Day vacations and heard grass-roots for-Goldwater demands which were brought back to Washington. For example, on April 14th, Congressman Earl Wilson (R.-Ind.) reported to his constituents on a "ground swell for Barry Goldwater as the standard-bearer . . . There were more questions asked about him than about any other man in any previous tours I have made of the Ninth District in my 10 terms."

• Local GOP leaders telephone or write the Senator in the same vein. For example, Noel Brown, Daytona Beach district leader, wrote on May 29th to congratulate Goldwater on the Republican victory in Texas, adding, "We will continue to fight for the party . . .", apparently meaning the Goldwaterean Republican party.

• Two Republican House members, Marguerite Church of Illinois and Donald Bruce of Indiana, have reintroduced Goldwater's Senate-rejected aid-to-education bill, a measure that would keep the Federal government out of the picture.

• Senior Republican Senators—particularly Policy Committee Chairman Bridges and Floor Leader Dirksen—are renewing their efforts to get Goldwater included in the weekly "leadership" meetings at the White House. Senator George Aiken, up for reelection next year, is an example of a "liberal" Republican who has begun to stress his agreements rather than differences with Goldwater.

• Democratic and Left Wing institutions are recognizing Goldwater as the *de facto* head of his party. After the Cuban disaster, Goldwater was the first Republican Senator summoned to the White House. It was on Goldwater's advice that the President subsequently called upon Herbert Hoover and Douglas MacArthur. Last May 8th, the leftist New York *Post* wrote that the Administration's "foreign policy reverses . . . have suddenly transformed Goldwater into a political figure to be reckoned with."

Much rain will fall, much snow will fly before another Presidential race—but the horses are already taking their warm-up canters. —H. A.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Don't Sell High, Don't Sell Low

Does U.S. Mean Don't Sell at All?

By Leslie Gould

Financial Editor of the New York Journal American

THE ELECTRICAL companies were convicted of price fixing and making collusive identical bids. This was the Philadelphia criminal case.

Now, in settlement of civil actions—there are 17 pending against General Electric—the Anti-Trust Division of the Justice Department wants the companies involved to agree to a consent decree.

The heart of this decree, which has been signed by one small company—Wheeler—is:

An agreement not to sell at "unreasonably low prices."

So, the companies can't sell at high prices, nor can they sell under the proposed decree at low prices.

Senator Hruska (R.-Neb.), and a member of the Anti-Trust and Monopoly sub-committee, sums it up:

"Here we have a situation where we have one of our branches of the Government in this room saying:

" 'Why don't you reduce prices? Why don't you get them lower?'

"And then we have another branch of the Government saying to you in the form of a court order, or asking you to put into a court order:

" 'We will not sell for lower prices, unreasonably low prices.' "

The Senator pointed out that the law bars "pirating"—whereby a company constantly reduces prices until it forces a competitor out of business. The anti-trust laws require competition, and the Robinson-Patman Act bans charging different prices. Yet, the Anti-Trust lawyers want a consent decree saying G. E. or Westinghouse or any of the other electrical companies cannot sell for "unreasonably low prices."

Then the Nebraskan asks:

"What kind of rat race is this that we are going to go all over the lot, and everyone of us in the Government is going to go in a different direction, and I suppose General Electric and Westinghouse and the other industries will go in still a different direction."

The wording of the decree, as proposed by Anti-Trust lawyers, is so vague as to what are "unreasonably low prices" that every time there is a question of pricing an item—be it a condenser or an egg beater—G. E. will have to call in a lawyer.

In fact, companies are so nervous on the subject that some already have taken this step, having a lawyer admonish both the selling company and the buying concern that there must be no favoritism on the prices—asked or given—and that the same price is available to anyone else.

The general effect of such a ruling will be to put up prices to the level of the most inefficient producer. If extended to other lines, it will wreck the American system of merchandising. In retailing, it will end "loss leaders" and curb the discounters.

The job of Anti-Trust is to see that there is competition and that it is fair. This was the basis of the electrical case at Philadelphia.

Reprinted with permission of the New York *Journal American*.

REPRINTS of this section available: single copy 20c; 10 for $1; 25 for $2; 100 for $5; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. Order by section number and date of issue.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50. After you have read each section of HUMAN EVENTS, put it in an envelope and mail it to someone else who will value its contents.

Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

The Monopoly Cycle

From the Cleveland Plain Dealer

Price-fixing by manufacturers is not the only violation of the nation's anti-trust laws. The United Mine Workers has been convicted by a jury in Tennessee of conspiring with major coal producers in the area, and with its welfare fund trustees, to monopolize the bituminous coal market there.

Suit in this instance was brought by a small coal producer who claimed he was being squeezed out of business by the conspiracy.

The anti-trust laws now have been brought to bear against price-fixing manufacturers and against a labor union conspiracy with employers to monopolize an industry. Since monopoly in any form is reprehensible, the cycle will not be complete until the law is applied to unions which, through collaboration with other labor organizations or with their own units, fix prices through monopolization, a practice the attorney general is trying to crack.

In the meantime, if it's any solace to the convicted electrical equipment manufacturers, they have company. Unions, it turns out, conspire to beat the anti-trust laws, too.

Taxpayers Might Revolt

If the spenders were required by law to attach a *tax bill* to their schemes, they would not promise all these benefits. If they suggested that *taxes be raised* to pay for these programs, the people would rebel, even turn them out of office. What a terrible thought!

But we must face facts. We do not have the money *for all these new programs* on the home front while we carry *the heavy defense burden of the cold war.* We must change the attitude in Washington, which is now best summed up in a remark by a New York Senator: "Our natural impulse, when we find a problem, is to *throw money at it* and hope it goes away."

—Rep. Glenn C. Cunningham (R.-Neb.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED